



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/637,409	08/11/2000	Paul S. Henry	1999-0785	7313

7590 12/07/2004

Samuel H Dworetsky
AT&T Corp
Post Office Box 4110
Middletown, NJ 07748-4110

EXAMINER

SHERKAT, AREZOO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/637,409

Applicant(s)

HENRY ET AL.

Examiner

Arezoo Sherkat

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10,12-14 and 16-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10,12-14 and 16-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

The indicated allowability of claims 11, 12, and 16 is respectfully withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Peters, (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,300 and Peters hereinafter) and Grimmer, (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,552 and Grimmer hereinafter). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10, 12-14, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters, (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,300 and Peters hereinafter), in view of Grimmer, (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,552 and Grimmer hereinafter).

Regarding claims 10 and 12, Peters discloses a method for providing access to multiple online accounts via a common password, the method comprising:

receiving a common password associated with an online account, and determining if the universal password is valid for the associated online account based upon a designated password which was previously generated for the associated online account, wherein the designated password was previously generated based upon a password transform calculation, the password calculation based upon a user ID for the

associated online account, the universal password, and a server name (Col. 2, lines 48-67 and Col. 3, lines 1-55).

Peter does not expressly disclose wherein authenticating the user is performed by calculating and a random number.

However, Grimmer discloses protected simple authentication involving the application of a one-way hash function on the user's name, password, and a random number and/or a time stamp (Col. 4, lines 42-67 and Col. 5, lines 1-7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Peters with the teachings of Grimmer because it would allow to include the password calculation based upon a user ID for the associated online account, the universal password, a server name and a random number with the motivation to provide for authentication of a certificate and prevent impersonation using a phony key pair (Grimmer, Col. 1, lines 28-45).

Regarding claim 14, Peters discloses a method for providing access to multiple Web accounts via a universal password which is valid for the multiple Web accounts, the method comprising:

providing a designated password for each of the multiple Web accounts, the designated password being calculated for each of the multiple Web accounts based on a hash function which incorporates the universal password as an input to the hash function, receiving the universal password for access to at least one of the multiple Web accounts, determining if the universal password is valid based on the associated

designated password for the at least one of the multiple Web accounts, and providing access to the at least one of the multiple Web accounts provided the universal password is valid (Col. 2, lines 48-67 and Col. 3, lines 1-55).

Regarding claim 18, Peters discloses wherein determining if the universal password is valid based on the associated designated password for the at least one of the multiple Web accounts includes:

receiving a user ID, receiving the associated designated password, and comparing the received associated designated password with a corresponding saved designated password for the at least one of the multiple Web accounts (Col. 2, lines 48-67 and Col. 3, lines 1-55).

Peters does not expressly disclose retrieving an encrypted random number based on the user ID.

However, Grimmer discloses retrieving an encrypted random number based on the user ID (Col. 4, lines 42-67 and Col. 5, lines 1-7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Peters with the teachings of Grimmer because it would allow to include retrieving an encrypted random number based on the user ID with the motivation to provide for authentication of a certificate and prevent impersonation using a phony key pair (Grimmer, Col. 1, lines 28-45).

Regarding claims 13 and 19, Peters discloses further comprising:

generating a designated password for each of the multiple online accounts which is accessible via the common password (Col. 2, lines 48-67 and Col. 3, lines 1-55).

Regarding claim 16, Peters discloses wherein the hash function also incorporates a user ID and an account server name as inputs to the hash function (Col. 2, lines 48-67 and Col. 3, lines 1-55).

Regarding claim 17, Peters does not expressly disclose wherein the hash function also incorporates a random number as an input to the hash function.

However, Grimmer discloses wherein the hash function also incorporates a random number as an input to the hash function (Col. 4, lines 42-67 and Col. 5, lines 1-7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Peters with the teachings of Grimmer because it would allow to include wherein the hash function also incorporates a random number as an input to the hash function with the motivation to provide for greater protection during transmission (Grimmer, Col. 4, lines 54-62).

Regarding claim 20, Peters does not expressly disclose generating a random number.

However, Grimmer discloses wherein providing a new designated password for the at least one of the multiple Web accounts if requested includes:

generating a random number, and calculating the new designated password based on at least the universal password and the random number (Col. 4, lines 42-67 and Col. 5, lines 1-7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Peters with the teachings of Grimmer because it would allow to include wherein the hash function also incorporates a random number as an input to the hash function with the motivation to provide for authentication of a certificate and prevent impersonation using a phony key pair (Grimmer, Col. 1, lines 28-45).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arezoo Sherkat whose telephone number is (571) 272-3796. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Arezoo Sherkat
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2131
Nov. 22, 2004



AU 2131
11/23/04